

1 DANIELLE K. HERRING, TX Bar No. 24041281  
(admitted *pro hac vice*)  
2 dherring@littler.com  
LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.  
3 1301 McKinney Street, Suite 1900  
Houston, Texas 77010  
4 Telephone: 713.951.9400  
Facsimile: 713.951.9212

5 COOPER J. SPINELLI, CA Bar No. 299299  
cspinelli@littler.com  
6 LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.  
7 50 W. San Fernando, 15th Floor  
San Jose, California 95113.2303  
8 Telephone: 408.998.4150  
Facsimile: 408.288.5686

9 ANDREW EPSTEIN, CO Bar No. 50530  
(admitted *pro hac vice*)  
10 aepstein@littler.com  
LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.  
11 1900 Sixteenth Street, Suite 800  
12 Denver, Colorado 80202  
Telephone: 303.362.6200  
13 Facsimile: 303.484.4352

14 Attorneys for Defendants

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
17 SAN JOSE DIVISION  
18

19 JONATHAN DAVIDSON,

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,  
HEWLETT-PACKARD ENTERPRISE,  
23 UNITED HEALTHCARE, UNITED  
HEALTHCARE SERVICES, INC.,  
24 UNITED HEALTH GROUP, DR.  
ANGELIQUE GREEN, DR. PETER  
25 STANGEL, DR. EDWARD  
GREENBERG, AND DOES 1 THROUGH  
26 50,

27 Defendants.

28 AND

**CASE NOS. 5:16-CV-01928-EJD;**

**5:17-CV-00694-BLF**

**DEFENDANTS' ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER  
CASES SHOULD BE RELATED**

CORINNA DAVIDSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED HEALTHCARE, UNITED  
HEALTHCARE SERVICES, INC.,  
UNITED HEALTHCARE INSURANCE  
COMPANY, UNITED HEALTH GROUP  
INCORPORATED, DR. ANGELIQUE  
GREEN, DR. PETER STANGEL, DR.  
EDWARD GREENBERG, DR. LAUREN  
STANDIG, AND DOES 1 THROUGH 50  
EXCLUSIVE,

Defendants.

Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 3-12, Defendants, Hewlett-Packard Company, Hewlett-Packard Enterprise Company, UnitedHealthcare, United Healthcare Services, Inc., United Healthcare Insurance Company, UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, Dr. Angelique Green, Dr. Peter Stangel, Dr. Edward Greenberg, and Dr. Lauren Standig, move the Court to consider whether the above-captioned cases are related as follows: Defendants request an Order (1) finding *Jonathan Davidson v. Hewlett-Packard Co., et al.*, Case No. 5:16-cv-01928-EJD (N.D. Cal.) (hereinafter “*Jonathan Davidson Action*”) and *Corinna Davidson v. UnitedHealthcare, et al.*, Case No. 5:17-cv-00694-BLF (N.D. Cal.) (hereinafter “*Corinna Davidson Action*”) are related matters; and (2) awarding such other relief to Defendants as the Court deems just and appropriate. Defendants’ motion is brought under Local Civil Rule 3-12 on the grounds that the two actions contain common questions of law and fact while finding the two actions related will serve interests in judicial economy.

# **I. STATEMENT OF REQUESTED RELIEF**

Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 3-12, Defendants request that the Court find the *Jonathan Davidson Action* is related to *Corinna Davidson Action*.

## **II. STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED [L.R. 7-4(a)(3)]**

This motion raises the following issues: (1) whether the *Jonathan Davidson Action* and *Corinna Davidson Action* involve common questions of law and fact; and (2) whether judicial economy would result from finding the *Corinna Davidson Action* is related to the first-filed *Jonathan Davidson Action*.

### III. INTRODUCTION/STATEMENT OF RELEVANT FACTS

Pursuant to Corinna Davidson's ("Mrs. Davidson") employment at Hewlett Packard Enterprise Company ("HPE"), she is a participant in HPE's medical benefits plans. (ECF No. 11-1 ¶ 44 in *Corinna Davidson Action*; Decl. of E. Karr, ¶ 3 (attached as "Exhibit 1").) Mrs. Davidson's husband, Jonathan Davidson ("Mr. Davidson"), is a beneficiary of HPE's medical benefit plans. (ECF No. 39 ¶ 3 in *Jonathan Davidson Action*; ECF No. 11-1 ¶ 44 in *Corinna Davidson Action*; Decl. of E. Karr, ¶ 4.) Mrs. Davidson's employer-sponsored medical coverage consists of two pieces: (a) the active medical benefit program offered to similarly-situated eligible employees of HPE (and other eligible affiliate companies); and (b) a supplemental medical benefit program (the "Supplemental Program")<sup>1</sup> that provides custodial skilled nursing care to Mrs. Davidson's husband. (Decl. of E. Karr, ¶ 5.) These benefits are component benefits of the comprehensive employee benefit plan provided to Hewlett Packard Enterprise Company employees.<sup>2</sup> (Decl. of E. Karr, ¶ 6.) Collectively, Mrs. Davidson's medical benefit programs are referred to as the "Plan."

Pursuant to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ("ERISA"), 29 U.S.C. §§ 1001-1436, as amended, the Plan is an employee welfare benefit plan. 29 U.S.C. § 1002(1).

Mr. Davidson has sought medical benefits from the Plan. (See ECF No. 39 ¶¶ 1-5 in *Jonathan Davidson Action*; see ECF No. 11-1 ¶¶ 12, 44 in *Corinna Davidson Action*.) Mr. Davidson has and continues to receive medical benefits from the Plan. (ECF No. 39 ¶¶ 3, 18 in *Jonathan Davidson Action*; ECF No. 11-1 ¶ 30 in *Corinna Davidson Action*.) Through the *Jonathan Davidson*

///

///

<sup>1</sup> Because Plaintiffs refer to certain aspects of the Plan, it is central to their claims, and no party would question the authenticity of the document, Defendants are entitled to rely upon the Supplemental Program summary plan description and attach it in support of this Motion. *United States v. Corinthian Colls.*, 655 F.3d 984, 999 (9th Cir. 2011) (citation omitted); *Parrino v. FHP, Inc.*, 146 F.3d 699, 706 (9th Cir. 1998), *superseded by statute on unrelated grounds as stated in McManus v. McManus Fin. Consultants, Inc.*, 552 F. App'x 713, 714 (9th Cir. 2014) (holding, in an ERISA case, when a complaint made reference to a defendant's "group plan" and its "cost containment program[,] a district court may properly consider ERISA plan documents (the authenticity of which is not contested and upon which the plaintiff's complaint necessarily relies)).

<sup>2</sup> Mrs. Davidson and her husband's medical benefits, between January 1, 2015 and October 31, 2015, were provided through the HP Inc. Comprehensive Welfare Benefits Plan. (Decl. of E. Karr, ¶ 7.) Effective November 1, 2015, Mrs. Davidson and her husband's medical benefits were provided through the Hewlett Packard Enterprise Comprehensive Welfare Benefits Plan. (Decl. of E. Karr, ¶ 8.)

1 *Action* and *Corinna Davidson Action*, Mr. and Mrs. Davidson, respectively, seek to expand the scope  
2 of this ERISA action by alleging state-law claims which ERISA preempts.<sup>3</sup>

#### 3 **IV. ARGUMENT**

4 Local Civil Rule 3-12 of the United States District Court for the Northern District of  
5 California permits the Court to find related actions if they “concern substantially the same parties,  
6 property, transaction or event”; and “it appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome  
7 duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different  
8 Judges.” Local Civil Rule 3-12 is very similar to Rule 42(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil  
9 Procedure which concerns consolidation of matters. The Court has broad discretion under Rule 42  
10 to consolidate cases pending in the same district. *Investors Research Co. v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for the*  
11 *Cent. Dist. of Cal.*, 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir. 1989). The Court should weigh the saving of time  
12 and effort finding the two actions related would produce against any inconvenience, delay, or  
13 expense that it would cause. *Finder v. Leprino Foods Co.*, Case No. 13-CV-02059-AWI-BAM,  
14 2016 WL 6875259, \*2 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 21, 2016) (citations omitted).

##### 15 **A. Both Cases Seek the Same Relief for the Same Claims Against Nearly Identical** 16 **Parties**

17 Both the *Jonathan Davidson Action* and the *Corinna Davidson Action* seek to recover  
18 damages against Defendants under a variety of state-law claims. (ECF No. 39 ¶¶ 74-106 in  
19 *Jonathan Davidson Action*; ECF No. 11-1 ¶¶ 80-114 in *Corinna Davidson Action*.) Both actions  
20 claim that Defendants violated state law in their administering the Plan. As to the many common  
21 questions of law involved in the *Jonathan Davidson Action* and the *Corinna Davidson Action*, by  
22 way of illustration only, Exhibit 2, under “Both Cases Seek the Same Relief for the Same Claims  
23 Against Nearly Identical Parties,” shows the identical state-law causes of action. Because each case  
24 arises from the same alleged conduct by Defendants and each case alleges substantially overlapping  
25 causes of action against largely the same parties, finding the matters related is appropriate. *Hacker*  
26 ///

27 <sup>3</sup> On January 11, 2017, the Court dismissed Mr. Davidson’s state-law claims against Defendants and dismissed the three  
28 individual doctor defendants. (ECF No. 75 in *Jonathan Davidson Action*.) On January 25, 2017, the corporate  
Defendants answered Mr. Davidson’s remaining allegations against them. (ECF No. 76 in *Jonathan Davidson Action*.)

1 *v. Peterschmidt*, Case No. 06-03468, 2006 WL 2925683, \*3 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 12, 2006). The *Corinna*  
 2 *Davidson Action* differs only with respect to a single cause of action (ECF No. 11-1 ¶¶ 109-114)  
 3 when compared to the claims asserted in the *Jonathan Davidson Action*. This single dissimilar cause  
 4 of action is insufficient to require different proceedings. *Modesto Irrigation Dist. v. Gutierrez*, Case  
 5 No. 06-CV-00453 OWW DLB, 2007 WL 915228, \*4 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 26, 2007) (finding  
 6 consolidation appropriate where three of fifteen claims in two different actions overlap).  
 7 Furthermore, all (with the exception of two) of the named defendants in the *Corinna Davidson*  
 8 *Action* are named in the *Jonathan Davidson Action*, which further supports finding the matters  
 9 related. *Nat'l R.R. Passenger Corp v. Camargo Trucking*, Case No. 12-CV-775 AWI-BAM, 2013  
 10 WL 101811, \*2 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 8, 2013) (finding consolidation appropriate when defendants in the  
 11 proposed consolidated actions are “similar although not identical” and the claims concern liability  
 12 for the same factual occurrence); *Team Enters., LLC v. W. Inv. Real Estate Trust*, Case No. 08-CV-  
 13 00872-LJO-SMS, 2008 WL 4712759, \*2 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 23, 2008) (finding consolidation  
 14 appropriate where the case involves the same or similar parties and similar claims).

#### 15 **B. Both Actions Share Common Factual Allegations**

16 The *Jonathan Davidson* and the *Corinna Davidson Actions* claim that Defendants’ alleged  
 17 conduct in administering the Plan violated state law. Exhibit 2, under “Both Actions Share Common  
 18 Factual Allegations,” demonstrates many of the overlapping factual allegations exist when  
 19 comparing the *Jonathan Davidson Action* and *Corinna Davidson Action*. The similarities in factual  
 20 allegations between the *Jonathan Davidson Action* and *Corinna Davidson Action* weigh in favor of  
 21 the Court’s finding the two matters related. *See Finder*, 2016 WL 6875259, \*5. From Defendants’  
 22 perspective, the only factual differences in the two matters are (1) that one is brought by a Plan  
 23 participant and the other action is brought by a Plan beneficiary, and (2) that the *Corinna Davidson*  
 24 *Action* includes factual allegations related to January 2017 care related to Plan administration. These  
 25 slight differences should not outweigh the vast similarities in the two actions’ respective allegations.  
 26 Specifically, the *Corinna Davidson Action’s* allegations related to January 2017 care are not  
 27 sufficiently different from her other allegations because the January 2017 allegations still arise from

28 ///

the same Plan which gave rise to all claims in both actions. (ECF No. 39 ¶ 3 in *Jonathan Davidson Action*; ECF No. 11-1 ¶ 44 in *Corinna Davidson Action*.)

**C. To Promote Judicial Efficiency, The *Jonathan Davidson Action* and *Corinna Davidson Action* Should Be Considered Related**

The saving of time and effort relatedness would produce includes avoiding potentially (1) incongruent results regarding whether ERISA preempts the state-law causes of action and whether the individual doctor defendants are appropriate parties; (2) duplicative discovery; and (3) inefficient motion practice. By comparison, any inconvenience, delay, or expense that finding the matters related would cause appears to be minimal. Both cases are in their infancy as (1) Defendants only recently answered the remaining claims in the *Jonathan Davidson Action* (ECF No. 76); (2) Defendants only recently removed Mrs. Davidson's state-law complaint to the Court (ECF Nos. 1, 11); and (3) no Rule 26 conference or Rule 16 proceedings have transpired. Thus, finding the matters related is appropriate. *Cf. Mills v. Beech Aircraft Corp.*, 886 F.2d 758, 762 (5th Cir. 1989) (upholding a denial of consolidation with regard to two matters where the cases were at different stages of preparedness for trial); *Nat'l R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 2013 WL 101811, \*3 (noting that due to the similar early procedural stages of the proposed consolidated actions, consolidation would not result in prejudice or delay); *In re Facebook Privacy Litig.*, Case No. C10-02389-JW, 2010 WL 5387616, \*1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 21, 2010) (noting that due to the similar early procedural stages of the proposed consolidated actions, consolidation is appropriate).

**V. CONCLUSION**

Because the *Jonathan* and *Corinna Davidson Actions* involve common questions of law and fact, *i.e.*, whether ERISA preempts the state-law causes of action based upon Defendants' administering the Plan, the Court should find the two actions are related.

Dated: March 10, 2017

Firmwide: 145520679.7 066902.1127

/s/ Danielle K. Herring  
 DANIELLE K. HERRING  
 COOPER J. SPINELLI  
 ANDREW B. EPSTEIN  
 LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.

Attorneys for Defendants